



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE UNITED STATES PEACE COMMISSION.

BY HAMILTON HOLT.

ON March 30th, 1910, the Hon. William S. Bennet, of New York, introduced into the House of Representatives the following joint resolution:

"Resolved: that the President of the United States be respectfully requested to consider the expediency of calling an international conference for the purpose of considering the possibility of limiting the armament of the nations of the world by international agreement."

Six days later the Hon. Richard Bartholdt introduced a resolution of much broader scope, whose purpose, as stated in its title, was "to authorize the appointment of a Commission to draft articles of international federation." The duties of the Commission, which was to consist of five members, were as follows:

"*1st.* To urge upon the attention of other governments the fact that relief from the heavy burden of military expenditures and from the disasters of war can best be obtained by the establishment of an international federation.

"*2nd.* To report to Congress, as soon as practicable, a draft of articles of a federation limited to the maintenance of peace, through the establishment of an international court having power to determine by decree all controversies between nations, and to enforce execution of its decrees by the arms of the federation, such arms to be provided to the federation and controlled solely by it.

"*3rd.* To consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war."

Though Mr. Bartholdt had himself introduced similar bills into previous Congresses, and John H. Small on March 18th, 1908, had presented to the House a memorial from the North Carolina Peace Society proposing the appointment of a Peace Commission, the present Bartholdt bill was conceived and drafted by the World Federation League (now the World Federation

Committee of the New York Peace Society). Some peace advocates were sceptical, but the bill was speedily endorsed by the International School of Peace of Boston and the New England Arbitration and Peace Congress held at Hartford, Connecticut, on May 11th, 1910. A distinguished delegation went to Washington to appear in its behalf before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Their addresses can be found in the pamphlet "International Federation for the Maintenance of Peace," House Committee on Foreign Affairs, May 7th, 1910. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, however, took the best ideas from the Bennet and Bartholdt resolutions and embodied them in a new bill under Mr. Bennet's name. This they reported back favorably to the House, which passed it unanimously on June 10th. On June 24th the Senate concurred. The bill was thereupon signed by the President and is now law. Its full text is as follows:

"Resolved etc.: That a Commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States to consider the expediency of utilizing existing international agencies for the purpose of limiting the armaments of the nations of the world by international agreement, and of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace, and to consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenditures of government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war.

"*Provided*, that the total expenses authorized by the joint resolution shall not exceed the sum of \$10,000 and that the Commission shall be required to make its final report within two years from the date of the passage of this resolution."

A careful reading of this bill discloses the fact that it is in its essential nature a measure to bring about a world federation limited to the maintenance of peace. Thus the United States announces to the world that she is ready to champion this idea in the council of nations. For the first time in the annals of history a great people have officially recognized that the true philosophy of the Peace Movement requires a world federation as the prerequisite of universal peace.

Henry IV of France was probably the first lawgiver to have a glimmer of this peace philosophy when he conceived his "Great Design" at the end of the sixteenth century. Other statesmen have also dreamed of universal Peace through federation, while many of the prophets and philosophers and most of the poets from Dante to Longfellow have seen the vision. Perhaps no one has

more clearly perceived the manifold implications of this philosophy than Emanuel Kant. In his famous essay, "Perpetual Peace," published in 1795, he declared that we can never have universal peace until the world is politically organized, and it will never be possible to organize the world politically until the majority of the nations have a representative form of government. At last all the peoples of the world have achieved in some measure representative government. Russia has its Duma; China has announced that shortly it will promulgate a constitution; while Turkey and Persia have each just gone through the throes of revolution and emerged with a vigorous parliament. If Kant's philosophy is sound, the world is at last ready for world organization and universal peace.

The only two powers that ever have or ever can govern human beings are force and reason—war and law. If we do not have one we must have the other. The problem before the world is how to decrease the area of war and increase the area of law until war vanishes and law envelops the world. At the present moment the world is organized into fifty-nine nations claiming independence, and within their territories—nominally at least—organization, law and peace prevail. We have already learned to substitute law for war in hamlets, towns, cities, provinces, states and even up to the fifty-nine nations; but in that international realm over and above each nation in which each nation is equally sovereign, the only way at the present moment for a nation to secure its rights is by the use of force. Force, therefore, or war, as it is called when exerted by a nation against another nation, is at present the only legal and final method of settling international differences. In other words, the nations are to-day in that stage of civilization where without a qualm they claim the right to settle their disputes in a manner which they would put their own subjects to death for imitating. The Peace Movement, therefore, is nothing but the process of substituting law for war.

But how can we best establish law in the international realm? Certainly not by the cumbrous methods of the present. To-day there is no such thing as a code of international law which is binding on the nations. What passes under the name of international law is simply a series of arguments, maxims, precedents and opinions. It is the work, not of legislators, but of scholars.

The nations are at perfect liberty to accept it or reject it, as they wish. Before we can have a real international law we must have behind it some conscious political organization to give it sanction and validity, and that implies a federation of the world.

The history of international law presents striking analogies to the history of private law, just as the history of international war does to private war. Professor T. J. Lawrence, in his essay "The Evolution of Peace," distinguishes these four stages in the evolution of private war:

"(1) Kinship is the sole bond; revenge and retaliation are unchecked, there being no authority whatever. (2) Organization is found an advantage and tribes under a chief subdue undisciplined hordes. The right of private vengeance within the tribe is regulated, but not forbidden. (3) Courts of Justice exist side by side with a limited right of vengeance. (4) Private war is entirely abolished, all disputes being settled by the courts."

Professor H. Stanley Jevons, who thus summarizes Lawrence, adds: "In international relations we are entering in the third stage." International law, therefore, is in the same state of development as private law of about the tenth century.

Likewise the history of the organization of the "United Nations" which is to give the sanction to international law will correspond to the history of the organization of the thirteen American Colonies into the United States. The "United Nations," however, has already reached the same stage of development as the American Colonies at the time of their first confederation.

The organization of the world has therefore begun. The first official step was taken in 1888 when James B. McCreary introduced a bill into the United States Congress establishing the Pan-American Conferences. These Conferences are the legislative branch of the Pan-American Federation of Republics. The germs of the Pan-American executive can be seen in the Bureau of the American Republics at Washington, D. C., though a distinct Pan-American Court is not yet in evidence.

The second step in world organization was the birth of the Interparliamentary Union at Paris, in the following year, due largely to the efforts of the English carpenter, William Randal Cremer, since crowned with the Nobel Peace Prize. The Interparliamentary Union is the germ of the federation of the parlia-

ments of the world. To its action is largely due the calling of the First Hague Conference by the Tsar of Russia and the Second Hague Conference by President Roosevelt. Some have seen in the Interparliamentary Union the germ of the Lower House of the World Parliament, the Hague Conferences being the germ of the Upper House.

The establishment of the Hague Conferences, however, is by far the most important step ever taken towards peace through world organization. No wonder the first Conference has been called the Magna Charta of International Law. In the Hague Court and the recurring Hague Conferences we see the germs of the international court and the parliament of man. The problem is how to develop these so that they will become the judicial and legislative departments of a powerful world constitution. The creation of the executive department of the "United Nations," though still in embryo, is contemplated in the clause of the Bennet joint resolution requiring the Peace Commission to consider "constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace."

Now what can the Peace Commission do? It cannot treat officially with foreign Governments, for it has no diplomatic status. That is as it should be. It would be extremely unwise for it to usurp in any way the functions of the American delegation to the Third Hague Conference. It would seem to be an established fact that all advances toward peace through international law are to be effectuated hereafter at the recurring Hague Conferences. The eight years' interval that elapses between them is none too long for a world public sentiment to ripen and crystallize. As Senator Root has well said:

"The world has entered upon an orderly process through which, step by step, in successive conferences, each taking the work of its predecessor as its point of departure, there may be continual progress towards making the practice of civilized nations conform to their peaceful professions."

When the present writer attended the Second Hague Conference in the summer of 1907, it was quite obvious that the chief trouble with that Conference was the fact that the delegates came there more or less unprepared. When resolutions were "sprung" on them they did not know just what to do. They had to report back to their Governments, but the Governments, not being on

the spot, were hesitant how to instruct them. Thus a great deal of time was lost and much was left undone that could otherwise have been done. The only nation that came to the Second Hague Conference thoroughly prepared was Germany. Her delegation devoted the whole winter before the Conference assembled to a thorough study of the questions to be brought before it. On many subjects she was the chief obstacle to progress there, but the thoroughness of her preparation enabled her to exert a greater influence on the results of the Conference than the inherent merits of her proposals justified. Our Government, therefore, will have at its service a Commission who will have devoted all their talents to mastering the greatest issue now before the world. The State Department, with its manifold duties, has neither the time nor equipment to compass the work. The delegates to the Third Hague Conference will be appointed only a few months before they go to Holland. They will have no time to work out any scheme of world federation. Upon the Peace Commission, therefore, will devolve the duty of pointing out how the United States can take the lead in this movement. Its report will enable our delegation to the Third Hague Conference to secure the greatest possible results in that most august world assembly. Surely no greater or nobler opportunity has ever come to five statesmen to serve humanity.

Now what are the problems that must come before the Commission? The joint resolution that brought it into being requires it to consider these three questions:

1. The limitation of armaments by international agreement.
2. The possibility of combining the navies of the world for peace.
3. Any other methods to bring about peace.

Let us take up each of these in order.

When the Tsar of Russia called the First Hague Conference of 1899 his fondest hope was that the burdens of overgrowing and ever-growing armaments that were impoverishing the peoples of the world might in some way be taken off their backs. He did not see that disarmament cannot take place until the world is politically organized and that it is just as absurd for nations to disarm before the existence of international courts, parliaments and executives as it would be for cowboys to discard their pistols before there are sheriffs and justices of the peace. The First Hague Conference started in bravely enough and assigned

the question of the limitation of armaments to one of its most important committees. It was the "frontispiece" of the Circular of the Russian Government, and the Russian delegation strained every nerve to have the Conference take some action in the matter. Colonel Gilinsky, who had charge of the question, prefaced the introduction of his proposals with these words:

"Will the peoples represented in this Conference be entirely satisfied, if, in going hence, we take them arbitration and the laws of warfare, but nothing for times of peace,—of this *armed* peace which is so heavy a burden on the nations, which crushes them to that point where it can be sometimes said that open war would perhaps be better than this state of secret war, this incessant competition in which all the world pushes forward larger and larger armies—larger now in time of peace than they used to be in times of greatest warfare? The various countries have engaged in war only once in every twenty or thirty years; but this armed peace lasts for decades, it precedes war and follows it."

Despite all of Russia's efforts to the contrary, the Committee which had the matter in charge made the following report:

"The members of the committee charged with the examination of the propositions of Colonel Gilinsky, relating to the first topic of Count Mouravieff's circular, have met twice. With the exception of Colonel Gilinsky, they have decided unanimously: first, that it would be very difficult to fix, even for a term of five years, the number of troops, without regulating at the same time other elements of the national defence; second, that it would be no less difficult to regulate by an international agreement the elements of this defence, organized in each country upon very different principles. Hence, the committee regrets its inability to accept the proposition made in the name of the Russian Government. The majority of its members believe that a more thorough study of the question by the governments themselves would be desirable."

The Conference accepted this memorial from the Committee and adjourned after having passed the following resolution:

"The Conference is of the opinion that the restriction of military charges which are at present a heavy burden on the world is extremely desirable for the increase of the material and moral welfare of mankind."

It also added the following wish (*vœu*):

"The Conference expresses the wish that the governments taking into consideration the proposals made at the Conference may examine the possibility of an agreement as to the limitation of armed forces by land and sea and of war budgets."

During the interval between the First and Second Hague Conferences the Governments paid no attention to these suggestions,

but went ahead increasing their armaments at a rate and on a scale hitherto unprecedented. The only two utterances by responsible heads of States against this militaristic aggrandizement that I recall were made by the British Prime Minister and the President of the United States. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in a notable speech at Albert Hall, London, in December, 1905, said:

"I hold that the growth of armaments is a great danger to the peace of the world. A policy of huge armaments keeps alive, and stimulates, and feeds the idea that force is the best, if not the only, solution of international differences. It is a policy that tends to inflame old sores and to create new sores, and I submit to you that as the principle of pacific arbitration gains ground, it becomes one of the highest tasks of a statesman to adjust those armaments to a newer and happier condition of things. What nobler rôle could this great country assume than at the fitting moment to place itself at the head of a League of Peace through whose instrumentality this great work might be effected?"

And Theodore Roosevelt, in a letter to the New York Peace and Arbitration Congress held in April, 1907, wrote:

"The most practical step in the diminishing the burden of expense caused by the increasing size of naval armament would, I believe, be an agreement limiting the size of all ships hereafter to be built."

England and the United States accordingly "reserved the right" to bring up the discussion of the limitation of armaments at the Second Hague Conference, especially as Russia had abandoned her championship of the cause and was proposing to bar it out of the discussion. Not, however, until after the Conference had been in session over eight weeks was the subject introduced. Then England made the following tentative proposition, although Germany, Austria, Russia and Japan had announced that they would take no part in the discussion:

"The Government of Great Britain will be ready to communicate each year to the powers that will do the same, its plan of constructing new war-ships and the expenditures which this plan will require. Such an exchange of information will facilitate an exchange of views between the governments on the reductions which by common agreement may be effected. The Britannic Government believes that in this way an understanding may be reached on the expenditures which the states that agree to pursue this course will be justified in entering upon their budgets."

After Mr. Choate in behalf of the American delegation had "expressed his sympathy for the views which have been stated by His Excellency the First Delegate of the British Delegation,"

the discussion was solemnly dropped and the whole question was tabled again in the following resolution:

"The Second Peace Conference confirms the resolution adopted by the Conference of 1899 in regard to the limitation of military expenditure; and inasmuch as military expenditure has considerably increased in almost every country since that time, the Conference declares that it is eminently desirable that the governments should resume the serious examination of this question."

Here the matter rests to-day. All of which shows, I think, that until we have gone much farther along the path of world federation, the problem of the limitation of armaments presents questions, as Chancellor von Bülow has said, "to which there is at present no concrete, serious, practical, realizable answer."

The second question before the Peace Commission—namely, the consideration of combining the navies of the world for peace—will also present many practical difficulties. This is primarily a problem of the use of force, and force except as exercised under law is always arbitrary and usually oppressive or tyrannous. As Professor John Basset Moore has well said:

"The great problem confronting those who wish to do away with war is how to employ the force necessary to the restraint or repression of evil without producing the legal condition of things called a state of war. The most striking imperfection in the international system to-day is the lack of a common agency for the enforcement of law. If, at the present time, a contest by force breaks out between two nations, the conflict is recognized as a war, and other nations assume the attitude of neutrals, even though the cause of the conflict be the flagrant disregard by one of the contending nations of a well-settled principle of international law. Such a condition of things involves an obvious incongruity, the remedy for which would be the organization of a common agency for the enforcement of a law; the addition, in other words, to judicial and legislative power of what we call executive power. This is a problem of the future, probably of the far-distant future; but it is an ideal and a goal toward which it is permissible to labor."

It is, perhaps, not over-sanguine to hope that the existing national armaments may be brought into regular and concerted action for compelling obedience to judicial decisions among nations that have agreed to this method of settling their disputes. It may even be anticipated that the combined military power of the Governments which agree to the foregoing may be used to assist one of themselves in a controversy with a nation that has not agreed previously to resort to arbitration and that refuses

so to agree upon request. Such an agreement would tend to enthrone law and to suppress arbitrary action. Entering into it would not subject the United States to the necessity of waging war through the erroneous action of its allies in an "entangling alliance," but only for extending the reign of law. This is the fundamental purpose of our Government, and perhaps the United States is now ready to go thus far.

But the questions of the limitation of armament and the proper use of force for preserving peace are only practical after the nations have *federated* themselves for that purpose. Given a world federation, or League of Peace, the problem of the establishment and exercise of an international police power will present no greater difficulties than the similar problem which confronted the framers of the United States Constitution or even of the Articles of Confederation. It must ever be borne in mind, however, that the world constitution will differ in this important respect from the United States Constitution. Our Constitution is both an instrument for federating the States and for guaranteeing each citizen within the Union certain rights; the proposed world constitution as yet merely federates the nations and has no relation whatsoever to any so-called "world citizen."

The third and final question before the Peace Commission is to "consider and report" on any other measures to bring about universal peace. This gives the Commission power to take up the only practical and promising "next step" in the Peace Movement, namely, world federation. That the world is already to some extent federated is proved by the existence of the Inter-parliamentary Union, the Pan-American and Hague Conferences. The world, however, has scarcely realized this, though glimmerings of the light are already penetrating high places. Our Government nevertheless is imbued with the idea, as is evident from its insistence upon periodical and self-governing conferences at The Hague, from the establishment of the present Peace Commission and from the following highly significant peroration in Secretary Knox's great address, "The Spirit and Purposes of American Diplomacy," delivered on June 15th at the Commencement of the University of Pennsylvania:

"We have reached a point when it is evident that the future holds in store a time when wars shall cease; when the nations of the world shall realize a federation as real and vital as that now subsisting between the

component parts of a single State; when by deliberate international conjunction the strong shall universally help the weak, and when the corporate righteousness of the world shall compel unrighteousness to disappear and shall destroy the habitations of cruelty still lingering in the dark places of the earth. This is the spirit of the wide world brooding on things to come. That day will be the millennium, of course; but in some sense and degree it will surely be realized in this dispensation of mortal time."

It is gratifying in this connection to remember that in 1890 before a single general arbitration treaty was in existence the United States Congress passed a resolution inviting our State Department to make treaties of arbitration with other nations similarly disposed. That was at a time when all disputes that did not end in war were settled by conciliation through diplomacy. In twenty years the world has gone from conciliation to arbitration. It is now ready to go from arbitration to a world federation. Thus again our Government takes the lead in the movement for universal peace.

Before the First Hague Conference assembled, a considerable literature already existed on world federation, of which that contributed by Penn, Franklin, Burritt, Sumner, Ladd, Hale and others in this country was by no means the least important. After the First Hague Conference, however, it became at once evident that world federation had passed from the dreams of peace advocates into the realities of practical statesmanship. Those Americans who have done much in the last decade to organize the world or spread the idea of world federation include among others Richard Bartholdt, W. J. Bartnett, Hayne Davis, Raymond L. Bridgman, Theodore E. Burton, Nicholas Murray Butler, Andrew Carnegie, Joseph H. Choate, Oscar T. Crosby, Samuel T. Dutton, John W. Foster, Henry B. Granger, William T. Hull, Frederick Lynch, Edwin D. Mead, John B. Moore, Elihu Root, Theodore Roosevelt, James Brown Scott, Albert K. Smiley, Benjamin F. Trueblood and Andrew D. White. Among these Hayne Davis and Richard Bartholdt deserve special recognition. Mr. Davis in many magazine articles has gone exhaustively into the problems of federation and has actually foreshadowed the principal actions of the governments as well as the Interparliamentary Conferences. In 1903 he outlined the formation of an International Union in the image of the United States, emphasizing the fact that the creation of the Hague Court actually constituted a world federation.

"To regard the formation of this United Nations as a fancy is to ignore the fact that it has already been formed. To look upon its final perfection in the likeness of the United States as visionary is to ignore the essential political history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."

Mr. Bartholdt has ever been foremost among American lawmakers as an advocate of international organization and federation. It was he who proposed the Interparliamentary resolution upon which President Roosevelt acted in calling the Second Hague Conference, and in accordance with those terms the American Delegation at that Conference proposed the establishment of a self-governing permanent international Assembly.

Perhaps the most important suggestions for federating the world to-day are those contained in Mr. Bartholdt's proposals at the Thirteenth Interparliamentary Conference at Brussels in 1905; Uruguay's proposals introduced by José Battle y Ordóñez, ex-President of Uruguay, at the Second Hague Conference on July 4th, 1907; Theodore Roosevelt's recent Nobel Peace address delivered May 5th at Christiania, Norway; and Andrew Carnegie's Rectorial address, entitled "A League of Peace," given before the University of St. Andrews on October 17th, 1905.

Mr. Bartholdt's suggestions contemplate a World Federation with a World Congress based on the following five fundamental guarantees:

1. The territory and sovereignty of each nation represented to be respected by all.
2. Each nation to have the right to arm itself according to its own judgment.
3. Each nation to have the right to withdraw at any time.
4. War to remain a lawful mode of action among the members in settling disputes, except as they severally agree to refer questions to arbitration.
5. The armed forces of all the nations to be at the service of the Congress for the enforcement of any decrees rendered by the Hague Court according to treaties of arbitration.

The proposals of ex-President Ordóñez are as follows:

"1. From the moment when ten nations (of whom half have at least 25,000,000 inhabitants each) shall agree to submit to arbitration the differences which may arise between them, they shall have the right to form an alliance for the purpose of inquiring into the disagreements and disputes which shall arise between the other nations and to intervene when they shall judge it advantageous in the interest of a just solution.

"2. These allied nations shall have the power to establish a tribunal of obligatory arbitration at The Hague (if the kingdom of Holland is a

party of the alliance) or at some other city which may be designated for the same purpose.

"3. This alliance in favor of obligatory arbitration will only intervene in cases of international disagreements, and never will have the right to interfere in the internal affairs of any nation.

"4. All the nations which subscribe to the principle of obligatory arbitration will have the right to become a party to the Alliance destined to suppress the evils of war."

Mr. Roosevelt's proposals contained in his Christiania address are in brief:

1. Mutual guarantees to respect national territory and sovereignty and to arbitrate all other questions.

2. The development of the Hague Court and Conferences.

3. The limitation of national armaments by international agreement.

4. A League of Peace, of enlightened Powers, "not only to keep the peace themselves, but to prevent by force, if necessary, its being broken by others."

Mr. Carnegie's suggestions are embodied in the following quotation from his Rectorial address:

"Five nations co-operated in quelling the recent Chinese disorders and rescuing their representatives in Peking. It is perfectly clear that these five nations could banish war. Suppose even three of them formed a League of Peace—inviting all other nations to join—and agreed that since war in any part of the civilized world affects all nations, and often seriously, no nation shall go to war, but shall refer international disputes to the Hague Conference or other arbitral body for peaceful settlement, the League agreeing to declare non-intercourse with any nation refusing compliance. Imagine a nation cut off to-day from the world. The League also might reserve to itself the right, where non-intercourse is likely to fail or has failed to prevent war, to use the necessary force to maintain the peace, each member of the League agreeing to provide the needed forces or money in lieu thereof, in proportion to her population or wealth. Being experimental and upon trial, it might be deemed advisable, if necessary, at first to agree that any member could withdraw after giving five years' notice, and that the League should dissolve five years after a majority vote of all the members. Further provisions and perhaps some adaptations would be found requisite, but the main idea is here."

It will be seen that all these four proposals contemplate Peace through Justice. All contemplate the use of force to compel obedience to the will of the League, though Mr. Carnegie only after a boycott. All contemplate the development of the Hague Court. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Bartholdt desire that territory and sovereignty shall be the subject neither of arbitration nor

of war, but shall be guaranteed as the basis for the structure of international justice. Señor Ordóñez and Mr. Carnegie seem to imply that disputes about territory and sovereignty may be the subject of arbitration, but not of war. Mr. Bartholdt and Mr. Roosevelt make no suggestions as to the number who shall enter the League, but Mr. Carnegie wants at least three and Señor Ordóñez at least ten, five of whom shall be great Powers. Mr. Bartholdt limits the use of force to members within the League. Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Carnegie and Señor Ordóñez propose the use of the League's armed forces against outside nations. Mr. Bartholdt and Mr. Carnegie would allow the withdrawal of a nation from the League upon due notice. Mr. Bartholdt contemplates the present policy of national armaments, Mr. Carnegie and Señor Ordóñez permit but do not seem to prefer present armaments, while Mr. Roosevelt requires the limitation of armaments.

There is some danger in the Roosevelt, Carnegie and Ordóñez proposals that a League of Peace should be organized with power to prevent "by force" its being broken by others. Such a League of Peace might easily become a League of Oppression. A League with power to exert its will without constitutional limitations on its own members, to say nothing of those without its jurisdiction, would have the right to be judge and sheriff in its own cause, and that is a violation of the first principles of justice. Constitutional safeguards, therefore, would seem to be essential to any League of Peace that is expected to be of enduring service to humanity.

Prior to the formation of "a more perfect union" our original thirteen States were united in a League or Confederacy somewhat like that now proposed on an international scale. They were obliged by the Articles of this Confederacy to respect each other's territory and sovereignty, to arbitrate all questions among themselves, to assist each other against any foreign foe, not to engage in war unless called upon by the Confederation to do so, or actually invaded by a foreign foe, and not to maintain armed forces in excess of the strength fixed for each State by all the States in Congress assembled.

It is notable that security against aggression from States inside or outside the American Union accompanied the agreement to **limit** armaments. Thus danger of war and size of armaments were decreased contemporaneously. Both our State

and National Governments are bound by strict constitutional limitations to prevent abuse of power invested in them. And these limitations have often protected the people against the Government itself. How, then, can any international Government which may come into being be trusted not to abuse its power?

Mr. Roosevelt's concluding statement seems to recognize these difficulties, for he says: "The combination [League of Peace] might at first be only to secure peace within certain definite limits and certain definite conditions." He does not, however, outline these "limits" and "conditions."

It will probably be found that any League of Peace likely to be established at the present time will have to be based on these three propositions:

1. Each nation in the League to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the others.

2. The armies and navies of the members of the League to be at its service to enforce the decrees of the International Tribunal in all questions that the members of the League previously agree to refer to arbitration.

3. The Armies and Navies of the League to sustain any member of the League in a dispute with any outside nation which refuses to arbitrate.

This would put the forces of the League on the side of law and order and not on the side of arbitrary will, as it might conceivably be under the proposals of Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Carnegie or Señor Ordóñez.

As far as the United States is concerned, the Peace Commission will have to remember that there are manifest advantages in making proposals which will require no constitutional amendments for their adoption by this country. All the foregoing proposals contemplate the use of the armed forces of the United States in a League of Peace. The power to declare war under our Constitution is vested in Congress alone, and even in time of war Congress is forbidden to make military appropriations for more than two years ahead. It is by no means certain, therefore, that either the Roosevelt, Bartholdt, Carnegie or Ordóñez proposal to put the army and navy of the United States at the service of a League of Peace is constitutional. Nevertheless, the organization of an international government, Tennyson's dream of "The Federation of the World," is essential to the further

progress of the Peace Movement. All obstacles will have to give way, even constitutional ones. The monster of war must be destroyed. The majesty of law co-extensive with human intercourse can alone achieve this beneficent and inevitable result.

The International Peace Congress which has just concluded its week's session at Christiania, on August 5th, and whose 600 delegates represented all the civilized nations of the earth, applauded every reference to the American Peace Commission and passed a resolution by acclamation urging all the nations to follow the lead of the United States. It is also announced that Mr. Bartholdt in behalf of the American Group will introduce the following resolution into the forthcoming Conference of the Interparliamentary Union at Brussels, from August 29th to September 2nd:

“Resolved, That, in order to devise definite plans for submission to the third Hague Conference, looking to the further perfection of a system of world federation by providing, in addition to an international judiciary, an international legislature as well as international executive powers for the enforcement of judicial decrees, this conference further requests each of the governments and parliaments here represented to forthwith proceed with the appointment and creation of a national commission analagous to the commission recently authorized to be appointed by the Congress of the United States, such commissions to report to their respective parliaments within two years, to the end that, by the time the third international conference will convene at The Hague, namely in 1915, each government may be ready with a well-defined plan of its own for the accomplishment of the purposes above set forth.”

If now our Peace Commission can outline a practical plan for World Federation the Governments can be depended upon to press along this line at successive Hague Conferences, until finally, as Victor Hugo prophesied in 1849, “the only battle-field will be the market opening to commerce and the mind opening to new ideas.”

HAMILTON HOLT.